

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-8, and 10 are pending herein.

I. The anticipation rejections of claims 1 and 3-5 based on Bang (US 2002/0000195), as noted on page 2 of the Office Action.

The USPTO respectfully rejects claims 1 and 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bang. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

A. Bang does not disclose a second switching valve provided on the precursory gas supplying line at a position downstream of the first switching valve at an outlet port of the precursory gas middle line, as claimed in claim 1.

Claim 1 claims in relevant part:

“wherein a second switching valve is **provided on the precursory gas supplying line and/or reactive gas supplying line** at a position downstream of the first switching valve **at an outlet port of the precursory gas middle line and/or the reactive gas middle line;**” (emphasis added)

No new matter is added by the amendments. Support for the amendments is found in present Figure 1. Regarding these limitations, it is respectfully not seen where Bang discloses the claimed structure quoted above.

For example, the USPTO respectfully argues on page 3 of the Office Action that structure 274 of Bang is the specifically claimed second switching valve provided on the precursory gas supplying line and/or the reactive gas supplying line. However, regarding the amendments, it is respectfully important to note that **structure 274 of Bang is not provided on the precursory gas supplying line.** Instead, as seen in Figure 2 of Bang, **structure 274 of Bang appears to be provided on the purported reactive gas supplying line.** Thus, Bang respectfully does not disclose a second switching valve provided on the precursory gas supplying line at a position downstream of the first switching valve at an outlet port of the precursory gas middle line, as claimed in claim 1.

In contrast, present Figure 1 illustrates at least one possible embodiment of the claimed structure quoted above. For example, present Figure 1 shows a gas vaporizer 62, 72. Present

Figure 1 further shows a precursory gas middle line 22 and switching valves 2b1 and 2b2. As further seen in present Figure 1, **valve 2b2 is provided at an outlet port of the precursory gas middle line 22.** In other words, valve 2b2 is one possible example of a second switching valve provided on the precursory gas supplying line at a position downstream of the first switching valve at an outlet port of the precursory gas middle line, as claimed in claim 1.

The distinction noted above is important and non-trivial because it results in significant advantages over conventional devices. For example, as explained on page 2 of the Office Action, the structure of claim 1 **improves throughput during a process of forming the thin film and improves quality of the thin film.**

Thus, it is respectfully asserted that Bang does not disclose all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that Fujioka does not anticipate independent claim 1.

B. The dependent claims.

As noted above, it is respectfully asserted that independent claim 1 is allowable, and therefore it is further respectfully asserted that dependent claims 3-5 are also allowable.

II. The obviousness rejection of claim 6 based on Bang in view of Ahn (US 2002/0122885), as noted on page 6 of the office Action.

As noted above, it is respectfully asserted that independent claim 1 is allowable, and it is further respectfully asserted that Ahn does not overcome the deficiencies in Bang as noted above in Section I regarding independent claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully asserted that dependent claim 6 is also allowable.

III. The obviousness rejection of claim 7 based on Bang in view of Udagawa (US 6,645,302), as noted on page 7 of the Office Action.

As noted above, it is respectfully asserted that independent claim 1 is allowable, and it is further respectfully asserted that Udagawa does not overcome the deficiencies in Fujioka as noted above in Section I regarding independent claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully asserted that dependent claim 7 is also allowable.

IV. The obviousness rejection of claim 8 based on Bang, as noted on page 8 of the Office Action.

As noted above, it is respectfully asserted that independent claim 1 is allowable, and therefore it is further respectfully asserted that dependent claim 8 is also allowable.

V. New claim 10.

New claim 10 is respectfully added. No new matter is added by the amendments. Support for new claim 10 is found in original claim 1 and present Figure 1.

VI. Conclusion.

Reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Please contact the undersigned for any reason. Applicants seek to cooperate with the Examiner including via telephone if convenient for the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

By: / Daniel P. Lent/
Daniel P. Lent
Registration No. 44,867

Date: February 10, 2012
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
20 Church Street, 22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No.: 23413